

**Remarks**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 2 and 4 contain allowable subject matter. Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of the claim 2 therein. Consequently, claim 1 and its dependent claim 3 are believed to be allowable. In addition, claims 6-11 have been amended to depend directly or indirectly from allowable claim 1. These dependent claims are likewise believed to be allowable.

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-18, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as allegedly being "anticipated" by Tsukui *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,557,045). Claims 1, 3, 6-9 and 11 are believed to be allowable as noted above. While not acquiescing in this rejection, independent claims 5 and 12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer as a matter of expediency. In addition, claims 13-18 and 20 have been amended to depend from claim 21. As explained below, Applicants respectfully submit that Tsuki et al. does not anticipate claim 21.

Claim 21 is directed to a communication apparatus including a storage section that stores a plurality of partial e-mail addresses. The storage section is configured so that one of the stored partial e-mail addresses can be the same as one or more of the e-mail address parts of another one of the stored partial e-mail addresses. By way of example, not by way of limitation, in the case of an e-mail address of abc@faxmail.co.jp, it is possible to store "co.jp" as a first partial e-mail address and "faxmail.co.jp" as a second partial e-mail address. Thus, the first partial e-mail address "co.jp" is the same as one or more the address parts of the second partial e-mail address "faxmail.co.jp". No such arrangement is disclosed by Tsuki et al.

Tsukui *et al.* discloses an e-mail apparatus in which the domain name and sub-domain name of an e-mail address are input without inputting the individual characters thereof. Specifically, the apparatus includes a memory that stores a plurality of top domain names and a plurality of sub-domain names in distinct fields, respectively. The user can use separate scroll

buttons 703, 704 and 705 to separately designate the top domain name and one or more sub-domain names.

Figure 5 of Tsukui *et al.* shows that the nominal partial e-mail addresses stored in the back-up memory 106 each comprises only one e-mail address part (*i.e.*, user name, sub-domain 1, sub-domain 2, and top domain). In such an arrangement, while "co.jp" may be argued to correspond to a partial e-mail address, there is no disclosure of this partial e-mail address (*i.e.*, "co.jp") being the same as one or parts of some other partial e-mail address. Indeed, because Tsuki *et al.* stores each e-mail address part separately, it is not possible for "co.jp" to appear as part of some other partial address.

The office action makes reference to Tsuki *et al.*'s disclosure at col. 5, lines 51-55 of dividing an e-mail address "in at least two, that is the user name and the domain name." However, such a division by two into user name and domain name would not result in one partial e-mail address being the same as one or more parts of some other partial e-mail address. The further description in the referenced portion of Tsuki *et al.* of dividing the domain in two is the situation discussed above with reference to Figure 5 and likewise does not result in one partial e-mail address being the same as one or more parts of some other partial e-mail address.

For at least these reasons, Tsukui *et al.* cannot anticipate claim 21 or any of its dependent claims 13-18 and 20.

Claims 10 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over Tsuki *et al.* in view Laiho *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,507). Claim 10 is believed to be allowable because it has been amended to depend from allowable claim 1. Laiho *et al.* is cited in connection with its disclosure of a communication terminal embodied as a mobile telephone. Laiho *et al.* does not remedy the deficiencies of Tsuki *et al.* with respect to claim 21, from which claim 19 depends, and thus the proposed combination of Tsuki *et al.* and Laiho *et al.* (even if proper) would not have resulted in the subject matter of claim 19.

Ooi *et al.*

Serial No. 09/822,245

Response to Office Action dated July 28, 2005

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:



---

Michael J. Shea

Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs

1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor

Arlington, VA 22201-4714

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100